

**REMARKS**

**Status of Claims**

The final Office Action mailed October 16, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-25, 27, 28, 33-39, 44-49, 51-58, 60-64, and 66-72 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 27, 39, 49, 58 and 64 have been amended, claims 2-5, 19-22, 33-35, 44-47, 51-54, 60-63 and 66-69 have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 10-14, 23-25, 27, 28, 36-39, 48, 49, 55-58, 64 and 70-72 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment and reply amends and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Request for Entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:**

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since: a) it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without raising any new issues via claim amendments that would require further consideration and/or search (since the only amendments to the claims are to place dependent claim features into the respective base claims, and amending other dependent claims accordingly), and b) at the very least, it lessens the number of issues for appeal by canceling a number of claims.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-25, 27, 28, 33-39, 44-49, 51-58, 60-64, and 66-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0099735 to Schroeder et al. (hereafter "Schroeder") in view of U.S. patent 6,823,495 to Vedula et al. (hereafter "Vedula"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

On page 4 of the final Office Action, with respect to the rejection of claim 44, whereby the features of now-canceled claim 44 have been incorporated into its base claim 43 (and whereby the other independent claims under rejection have been similarly amended), its asserts that “paragraph [0039] of Schroeder teaches that a user can choose the translation format.”

While the above statement on its face is essentially correct, it falls well short of the features recited in claim 44 (now in claim 43). In particular, claim 43 now recites that the step of receiving a manual entry of parameters comprises receiving user input of an EDI standard, a version of the standard, a transaction set, a direction, and mapping rules for the standard data model. Numbered paragraph 0039 of Schroeder merely describes that a recipient trading partner can choose to translate their XML data to a select list of formats defined by the system, whereby at best, this merely teaches the selection of a particular EDI standard and version. It does not teach or suggest the capability of a user to select a particular transaction set, a direction, and mapping rules for the standard data model.

Accordingly, as Vedula does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Schroeder, as practically admitted in the final Office Action, presently pending independent claim 43 is patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Furthermore, with respect to presently pending independent claim 1, whereby the features of now-canceled claim 2 have been incorporated into that claim, page 4 of the Office Action asserts that “It is noted that the Schroeder generic data maps contain the information necessary to create a custom mapping. Schroeder teaches translation among trading partner formats, it having been implicit that such a translation process requires a custom mapping from source to target formats.” Applicants strongly disagree with this assertion made in the final Office Action.

Presently pending independent claim 1 allows for the claimed data models to be customized. No such customized data models (for read in and read out data) are taught or suggested by Schroeder. In fact, Schroeder’s super map teaches away from this customization by teaching a super map that includes all the data segments and elements for a particular transaction. Again, the ability to allow a user to enter in his/her own data is much

different, and not a variant, from an automated system that does not allow such user inputs, whereby the system of Schroeder would not be amenable to the “user inputted” features as recited in claim 1. The comments made on page 4 of the final Office Action that Schroeder’s generic data maps contain information necessary to create a custom mapping is by itself immaterial, since there is no teaching in Schroeder as to any user-inputted feature, but rather Schroeder’s super map teaches away from any user-inputted features.

Accordingly, as Vedula does not rectify the above-mentioned shortcomings of Schroeder, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Similarly, with respect to the other independent claims under rejection, which have been respectively amended to include the features of their respective dependent claims 2, 33, 51 and 66, the comments made on page 4 of the Office Action regarding those claims falls well short of the features recited in those claims (now incorporated into their respective base claim), and thus those independent claims are also patentable over the cited art of record.

### **Conclusion**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 4, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819